

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 5, 8-11, 12-14, 16, 17, 22 and 23 have been amended. New claims 25-28 have been added. Claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended and new claims are respectfully requested.

CHANGES TO THE TITLE

On page 2, item 1, of the Action, the Examiner states that the Title of the invention is not descriptive. Therefore, the Title has been amended herein to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Approval of the amended Title is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-8, 13 AND 15-24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED OVER SATO (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,826,674)

The rejections of claims 1-8, 13 and 15-24 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 and 16 are amended herein to clarify that the structure information output unit outputs structure information which includes a plurality of parameters each of which determines an operation of each of the combinational circuits. (See, for example, page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 10, of the present specification).

Sato discloses that the second execution control unit, which decodes the data flow designation instruction, "sets the input and/or output interfaces of a processing unit" (See column 10, lines 32-41). Thus, the data flow designation instruction defines the connections among the processing units. Sato indicates that the data flow designation instruction also defines the processing content of the processing unit (see column 10, lines 41-44); however, the processing content is defined by changing the connections of circuits in the processing unit. (See column 14, lines 43-48).

Thus, the second execution control unit (specifically, the Y decoder 62y) outputs information that defines the connections among the processing units, or the connections among

the circuits within a processing unit, rather than the operation of the processing unit or the circuit itself.

On the other hand, the structure information output unit, as recited in claim 1, for example, outputs a plurality of parameters each of which determines the operation of each of the circuits constituting the second operating unit, such as the position of the bit to be output from the multiplexer, the shift amount of the right shifter, and the mask pattern to be output from the pattern generator, for example.

Similarly, independent claim 16 recites the structure information includes a plurality of parameters each of which determines an operation of each of the combinational circuits.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Dependent claims 2-8, 13, 15 and 17-24 inherit the patentability of their respective base claim and, thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Furthermore, as recited in dependent claim 6, the structure information can be supplied not only from the memory, but also from the predetermined field within the instruction or the predetermined register (special-purpose register). On the other hand, in Sato, the configuration data supplied to the template section 72 is all from the CREG 75, which stores the configuration data read out from the CRAM 76.

Regarding dependent claim 7, the predetermined register is automatically updated as being designated by the structure information stored in the memory. On the other hand, Sato only discloses that the CREG 84 (not CREG 75) is rewritable and the data stored therein can be changed (See column 16, lines 27-62).

Regarding dependent claim 8, the load instruction is supplied to the first operating unit since it is one of the predetermined instructions executed by the first operating unit recited in independent claim 1. On the other hand, "DFLOAD BCi" of Sato, which is an instruction to load the configuration data Ci from the data RAM 53 to the CRAM 76, is one of the data flow designation instructions 25. (See column 15, line 61 to column 15, line 7). Therefore, "DFLOAD BCi" is supplied to the controller 77 of the DFU 57.

Regarding dependent claims 22 and 23, these claims stand rejected on the same basis as claim 8, as stated on page 4, item 11, of the Action. However, claims 22 and 23 correspond to the allowable claims 9 and 10, respectively, and not to rejected claim 8. The cited portion of Sato (column 9, lines 22-37, and Fig. 13) does not disclose the issuance of a plurality of

instructions, as recited in claim 22, nor the issuance of the transfer instruction, as recited in claim 23.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 12 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SATO

Dependent claims 12 and 14 inherit the patentability of independent claim 1 which, as stated above, patentably distinguishes over Sato. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 12 and 14 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

On page 7, item 19, of the Action, the Examiner objects to claims 9-11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that claims 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.

Dependent claims 9-11 depend from independent claim 1, which patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 9-11 patentably distinguish over the prior art, as they stand.

NEW CLAIMS 25-28

New claim 25 depends from independent claim 1 and claims 26-28 depend from independent claim 16. Support for new claim 25 can be found, for example, in Fig. 13 and page 21, line 6, to page 24, line 8. New claims 26-28 correspond to claims 13, 14 and 25 respectively.

Claims 25-28 inherit the patentability of their respective base claim and, thus, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 25-28 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or

rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 28, 2006

By: 
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501